

## **Appendix E**

### **Cost-Effectiveness Analysis Model**



### **Cost-Effectiveness Analysis Model**

As discussed in the report, certain factors need to exist for cold-ironing to be cost effective: a number of ships have to make several annual visits to the same terminal, the berthing times need to be of sufficient duration, and the ships have to require a significant power demand. Staff developed a spreadsheet to evaluate these and other important variables in determining the cost effectiveness of cold-ironing ocean-going vessels. Table E-1 contains an example spreadsheet that includes inputs for evaluating cold-ironing three reefer ships that visit the same berth. The example illustrates the case where the ships are modified to carry a transformer at \$1.5 million per ship. Shore-side cost was estimated at \$3.5 million. The major input values are in bold print, including:

- Ship-side cost
- Shore-side cost
- Berthing time
- Annual ship visits
- Number of ships visiting same berth
- Total auxiliary engine power, in kW
- Percent load for engines
- Cost of electricity from grid
- Auxiliary engine operating cost

Table E-2 provides values for some of the ship characteristics used in the cost-effectiveness analysis, by ship category, including: 1) total capacity of auxiliary engines (both an average value used for emissions inventory purposes and the range of total capacity used in the cost-effectiveness analysis); 2) average load; 3) berthing time (both an average value used for emissions inventory purposes and the range of berthing times used in the cost-effectiveness analysis); 4) annual visits (both an average value used for emissions inventory purposes and the range of visits used in the cost-effectiveness analysis); and 5) the range of electrical cost.

In addition, information on the derivation of the cost for operating an auxiliary engine on distillate fuel is included in Attachment E-1.

Because of the complexity of the container-ship category, additional information was included in the following appendix, Appendix F, on the cost-effectiveness analysis for this category. The appendix provides additional examples for how the total capacity of auxiliary engines was established, and how the berthing times and annual visits were established.

PRELIMINARY DRAFT—DO NOT CITE OR QUOTE

**Table E-1: Example spreadsheet used to calculate cost-effectiveness values for cold-ironing three reefer ships**

				Number of frequent flyer ships				Total auxiliary engine power (kw)		% load		NOX (TPY)		PM (TPY)		ROG (TPY)		SOX (TPY)					
CAPITAL COSTS				SHIP OPERATING DATA				ship emissions		3		3300		0.62		92.6		1.7		2.7		1.7	
Ship side ship retrofit costs (\$ per ship)				\$1,500,000				power plant emissions								0.6		0.1		0.1		0.0	
total capital costs				\$4,500,000				net time		58						92.0		1.6		2.6		1.6	
annual costs-10				\$582,750				annual visits		17													
Shore side shore cost (\$ per terminal)				3,500,000				REPEATING COST															
affected berths				1				Labor costs															
total capital costs				\$3,500,000				electrician costs				100 \$/hr											
annual costs-10				\$453,250				hours				8											
								annual occurrences				102											
A/P factor-10 year				0.1295				staff required				3											
								costs				\$244,800.00											
Summary of Cost								Electrical costs															
ship annual																							
capital recovery																							
costs				\$582,750				grid cost				16				cents/kw							
shore annual																							
capital recovery																							
costs				\$453,250				aux eng op cost				11				cents/kw							
repeating cost				\$547,403																			
total				\$1,583,403				cost per visit per ship				\$5,933.40											
								total costs				\$302,603.40											
								total kW				6,260,760.00											
Emission Factors for Calculation																							
NOx EF		13.9		g/kw-hr																			
PM EF		0.25																					
ROG		0.4																					
SOX		0.25																					
Fuel Specific Emission Factors																							
		mgo (0.5%S)		mgo (0.1%S)																			
NOx EF		13.9		13.9																			
PM EF		0.38		0.25																			
ROG		0.4		0.4																			
SOX		2.1		0.25																			
RESULTS																							
Percentage costs						Cost Effectiveness																	
						cost in 2005																	
ship						36.8						dollars						\$1,583,403					
shore						28.6																	
labor						15.5						\$/ton nox						\$17,207					
electricity						19.1						\$/ton pm						\$1,004,993					
												\$/ton all											
												pollutants						\$16,194					

**Table E-2: Ship Characteristics Used in Cost-Effective Analysis**

<b>Category</b>	<b>Average Total Auxiliary Engine Capacity</b>	<b>Range of Total Auxiliary Engine Capacity</b>	<b>Load (percent of full load)</b>	<b>Berthing Time</b>	<b>Annual Visits</b>	<b>Electrical Cost</b>
Container ship	6,500 kW	5,800 to 7,500 kW	0.19	65 hr/visit average with range of 4-230 hr/visit for POLA/POLB; 22 hr/visit average with range of 8-65 hr/visit for Oakland	Average of 8 visits per year with range of 1 to 25 visits per year for POLA/POLB; Average of 6 visits per year with range of 1 to 23 visits per year for Oakland	8-10 cents per kw
Passenger	NA	6 to 11 MW*	NA	10 hr/visit	Average of 21 visits per year with range of 1 to 105 visits per year	18-69 cents per kw
Reefer	3900 kW	3,300 to 4,200 kW	0.3-0.6	60 hr/visit	Average of 12 visits per year with range of 1 to 17 visits per year	11-22 cents per kw
Tanker—diesel-electric crude	NA—5 MW for pumping; 800 kW hotelling*	NA	NA	37 hr/visit; 24 hr/visit for pumping	range of 6 to 22 visits per year	18-47 cents per kw

PRELIMINARY DRAFT—DO NOT CITE OR QUOTE

Tanker—non-diesel-electric crude	NA—600 kW for hotelling*	NA	NA	Average of 37 hr/visit with range of 11 to 130 hr/visit for POLB; Average of 20 hr/visit with range of 9 to 25 hr/visit for Bay Area ports	Average of 9 visits per year with range of 1 to 47 visits per year	9-13 cents per kw
Tanker--product	NA—1.5 MW for pumping; 500 kW hotelling*	NA	NA	25 hr/visit; 19 hr/visit for pumping; pumping occurs 60% of visits	Average of 4 visits per year with range of 1 to 47 visits per year	9-110 cents per kw
Vehicle carrier	2,850 kW	NA	0.26	45 hrs/visit	Average of 8 visits per year with range of 1 to 9 visits per year	8-59 cents per kw
Bulk	1,000 kW *	NA	NA	20 hr/visit for Oakland; 77 hr/visit for all other ports	Average of 2 visits per year with range of 1 to 19 visits per year	8-14 cents per kw

\* actual power consumption

**Attachment E-1**

**Auxiliary Engine Fuel Costs**

Assumptions/Basis

- Fuel costs: \$485/metric ton for MGO

Estimate taken from Lloyd's List, Bunker 60—Web page:

<http://www.lloydslistbunker60.com/>

- Diesel engine efficiency: 35 percent
- Energy Content: 135,000 BTU/gal for MGO
- Density fuel: 306 gal/metric ton for MGO

Cost for using MGO

3413 BTU/kW x \$485/metric ton x metric ton/306 gal x gal/135,000 BTU / 35 percent

= \$0.11 per kW-hr

Summary

Cost effectiveness calculations will use \$0.11 per kW-hr for MGO